



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,090	12/09/2003	Jea-Woo Park	1572.1255	2809
21171	7590	10/19/2005		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER BROUSSARD, COREY M	
			ART UNIT 2835	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H:9

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/730,090	Applicant(s) PARK, JEA-WOO	
	Examiner Corey M. Broussard	Art Unit 2835	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-6, and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Long et al. in view of Martucci. With respect to claim 1, Long teaches a computer main body (102) and a docking station (400 may be a docking tray according to page 5 paragraph 52 line 4). The computer main body and docking station each have a connection port to receive electrical power (126' and 422 respectively). Long also teaches of an AC/DC adapter main body (200) with a DC power cable (230) and a power supplying jack (224') at an end. Long does not disclose a second cable branched off from the power supply cable with a jack at one end, or explicitly teach that a data connection exists between the docking tray and computer. However, it is inherent that in order for the computer to function with the docking station, a data connection must exist between the two devices. A data connection between a computer and peripheral device (such as a docking station) transmits digital data, which is inherently DC power. Martucci teaches of a power supply cable (1) with a grounding cable (4) branched off and ending in a grounding jack (19). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the AC/DC adapter system of Long with the auxiliary grounding wire of Martucci to obtain an AC/DC adapter capable of electrically connecting to both the computer and docking station

where one device would receive electrical power and both would be directly connected to the ground plane of the AC/DC adapter for the benefit of an auxiliary ground path better protecting the two devices from transients.

3. With respect to claim 2, Long as modified by Martucci fails to disclose the grounding jack having the same cross section and size as the grounding terminal of the power supply jack. The rationale that a particular shape is a design choice may be found in legal precedent: *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a separate grounding jack as taught by Martucci of any known size and shape that is known for use with plugs for the benefit of a low cost widely available connector.

4. With respect to claim 3, Long teaches an AC/DC power supply adapter base (200) with a power cable (230) terminating at a power supplying jack (224'). Long does not disclose a second cable connected to the power cable, or explicitly teach that a data connection exists between the docking tray and computer. However, it is inherent that in order for the computer to function with the docking station, a data connection must exist between the two devices. A data connection between a computer and peripheral device (such as a docking station) transmits digital data, which is inherently DC power. Martucci teaches of a power cable (1) with a grounding cable (4) connected to the power cable and terminating at the other end in a grounding jack (19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the AC/DC adapter of Long with the auxiliary grounding wire of Martucci to obtain an AC/DC adapter capable of connecting a portable device (400) and the

interfacing docking station (100) where one would receive power through the power supplying jack and the other would be connected through the grounding jack to supply an alternative ground path.

5. With respect to claim 4, Long as modified by Martucci teaches of a power supplying jack (224') with a terminal (212') for supplying DC power and a tubular grounding conductor (214') coaxial with the terminal (Fig. 9).

6. With respect to claims 5 and 6, Long as modified by Martucci fails to disclose the grounding jack having a tubular grounding conductor and the same dimensions as power supplying jack. The rationale that a particular shape is a design choice may be found in legal precedent: *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a power and grounding jack as taught by Long modified by Martucci in any known size and shape that is known for use with plugs for the benefit of a low cost widely available connector.

7. With respect to claim 8, Martucci as modified by Long teaches that the grounding jack (19) has a grounding conductor (10) and no power supply terminal.

8. With respect to claim 9, Long teaches an AC/DC power supply adapter base unit (200) with a power cable (230) terminating in a power supplying jack (224') for connecting to a first (100) and second (400) electrical device. Long does not disclose a second cable splitting off from the power cable, or explicitly teach that a data connection exists between the docking tray and computer. However, it is inherent that in order for the computer to function with the docking station, a data connection must exist between the two devices. A data connection between a computer and peripheral device (such as

a docking station) transmits digital data, which is inherently DC power. Martucci teaches a power supplying cable (1) with a grounding cable (4) splitting off from the power cable (see Fig. 1) and terminating in a grounding jack (19). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the AC/DC adapter of Long with the power cable and auxiliary grounding wire of Martucci to obtain an AC/DC adapter with a power supplying cable and jack providing a power supply path and first ground path for a first electrical device, and a grounding cable split from the power supplying cable and terminating in a grounding jack providing a second ground path other than the first for a second electrical device for the benefit of an auxiliary ground path better protecting the two devices from transients.

9. With respect to claim 10, Long as modified by Martucci teaches of a power supplying jack (224') with a terminal (212') for supplying DC power and a tubular grounding conductor (214') coaxial with the terminal (Fig. 9).

10. With respect to claims 11 and 12, Long as modified by Martucci fails to disclose the grounding jack having a tubular grounding conductor and the same dimensions as power supplying jack. The rationale that a particular shape is a design choice may be found in legal precedent: *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a power and grounding jack as taught by Long modified by Martucci in any known size and shape that is known for use with plugs for the benefit of a low cost widely available connector.

11. With respect to claim 13, Martucci teaches that the grounding jack (19) has a grounding conductor (10) and no power supply terminal.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-13 have been considered but are not persuasive, see the rejection of the claims above. The claims are rejected on the same grounds and same references presented in the previous office action.

Conclusion

13. This is a RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/730090. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corey M. Broussard whose telephone number is 571 272 2799. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on 571 272 2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


cmb



NATOLY VORTMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER